

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

James Gordon Gibson,)	Civil Action No. 2:13-3134-MGL
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
Director Holly Scaturro, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	
)	

Plaintiff James Gordon Gibson, (“Plaintiff”), an inmate proceeding *pro se*, filed the instant action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Wallace W. Dixon for pre-trial handling.

On December 19, 2014, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation, (“the Report”), (ECF No. 53), recommending that Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, (ECF No. 46), be denied. Objections to the Report were due by January 8, 2015. Plaintiff did not file an Objection to the Report. The matter is now ripe for review by this Court.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). In the absence of a timely filed Objection, a district court need not conduct a *de*

novo review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

Applying the above standards to the instant matter, the Court has carefully reviewed the record, applicable law, and the Magistrate Judge’s Report, (ECF No. 53), and finding no clear error in the Report, the Court adopts and incorporates it by reference. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, (ECF No. 46), is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Mary G. Lewis
United States District Judge

April 15, 2015
Columbia, South Carolina